

## Maryland Law Review

---

Volume 32 | Issue 3

Article 2

---

### Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

---

#### Recommended Citation

*Editorial Section*, 32 Md. L. Rev. 187 (1972)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol32/iss3/2>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact [smccarty@law.umaryland.edu](mailto:smccarty@law.umaryland.edu).

# Maryland Law Review

---

---

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews  
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

---

---

## STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

---

### *Editor-in-Chief*

W. MICHEL PIERSON

### *Managing Editor*

CHARLES C. SHELTON

### *Articles Editors*

DOUGLAS H. JONES

KAROL LYN NEWMAN

### *Research Editor*

JOHN M. SIPPLE, JR.

### *Notes and Comments Editors*

JOHN B. CONNARTON, JR.

STEVEN P. RESNICK

WILLIAM T. TORGERSOIN

### *Associate Editor*

CHRISTOPHER D. OLANDER

---

### *Staff*

RICHARD D. BENNETT

DONALD L. DeVRIES, JR.

BARBARA S. KIND

PHILLIP A. PROGER

---

### *Faculty Advisor*

HAL M. SMITH

---

---

## EDITOR'S NOTE

In 1966 Congress passed the Freedom of Information Act, which was intended to open the workings of government to the public by requiring disclosure of public records by administrative agencies. Today, almost seven years later, this objective remains unfulfilled. In this issue of the *Review* Charles H. Koch, Jr. examines the reasons for the failure of the Act, concluding that the blame is not properly placed with the administrative agencies subject to its provisions. Writing from an unusually qualified standpoint, he offers suggestions for a more effective implementation of the goal of providing information about government to the public in order that a more informed electorate may take part in the democratic process.

Charles Cahn II presents a comprehensive review of the legal treatment of contractors' payment bonds in Maryland. Particular

emphasis is placed in his article upon the practical problems which attorneys may encounter in litigation concerning payment bonds.

Recently the Maryland Securities Commissioner promulgated rule S-7, which governs the private placement of securities in Maryland. This experimental attempt to redefine the private offering exemption forms the basis for a student comment which explores the background, purpose and terms of the rule. A second student offering is a critical analysis of the United States Supreme Court's 1972 decision in *Kastigar v. United States* concerning the clarification of constitutional standards for witness immunity statutes; the note also provides suggestions for change in the Maryland immunity statutes in light of this decision. A final student note dissects a recent decision in a very complex area — the estate taxation of life insurance under the Internal Revenue Code.

The *Review* is pleased to announce the addition of five new faculty members; Isaiah Baker, Alan D. Hornstein, Robert I. Keller, Peter E. Quint and Peter S. Smith.